

東洋大学学術情報リポジトリ Toyo University Repository for Academic Resources

# L2 Learners ' Attitudes toward Communicative Language Teaching at One Japanese University

著者	岩本 典子
著者別名	IWAMOTO Noriko
journal or publication title	The Bulletin of the Institute of Human Sciences , Toyo University
number	19
page range	11-26
year	2017-03
URL	<a href="http://id.nii.ac.jp/1060/00008734/">http://id.nii.ac.jp/1060/00008734/</a>

## L2 Learners' Attitudes toward Communicative Language Teaching at One Japanese University

Noriko IWAMOTO\*

Globalization has advanced in Japanese society and English communicative skills have gained more importance. However, many Japanese people have difficulty acquiring English communicative competence by means of current English education programs in Japan. The major reason for this probably rests in the fact that university entrance examinations mainly focus on grammatical knowledge and translation skills rather than true communication (Kikuchi, 2006). In 2009, the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) tried to reform university entrance examinations by revising the national syllabus for English teaching. The syllabus, which was implemented in 2013, placed more emphasis on developing oral communication skills and promoting the use of communicative language teaching (CLT) (Abe, 2013; Nishino, 2012).

CLT is defined as “a language approach that emphasizes the communication of meaning rather than the practice of grammatical forms in isolation” (Ngoc & Iwashita, 2012, p.26). According to Butler (2011), CLT was introduced in Asia in the 1970s, but it was not until the late 1980s and the early 1990s that CLT became the center of attention; this probably was due to a great gap between its principal focus on communicative competence and the traditional way of teaching in many parts of Asia, which emphasize language forms and grammatical rules. Because of this gap, many studies have explored the attitudes and beliefs of teachers implementing CLT in classrooms, with less attention being given to L2 learners' attitudes toward CLT. Therefore, this study investigates university students' attitudes toward CLT and explores how their attitudes relate to their L2 affective factors.

### Literature Review

Many studies on CLT have focused on teacher beliefs and attitudes toward CLT, while less attention is paid on learner attitudes toward CLT. Most researchers who did address this issue reported the majority of learners have positive attitudes toward CLT. For example, Thorne and Qiang (1996) reported that two trainee teachers

---

\* An associate professor in the Faculty of Science and Engineering, and a research fellow of the Institute of Human Sciences at Toyo University

successfully incorporated oral activities into English classrooms in China. This motivated most learners to improve their ability to use English. Savignon and Wang (2003) investigated 174 university Taiwanese EFL learners' attitudes with regard to meaning-based and form-focused teaching and found that a majority of them expressed a preference for communicative practices and negative attitudes toward form-focused instruction. Shower (2010) compared 11 university students in CLT class and 10 university students in the pattern-drill teaching class by using questionnaires, interviews, and classroom observations and found that CLT increased learner's communicative competence and motivation to learn English more than pattern-drill based teaching. Pae and Shin (2011) investigated 119 Korean university students learning English in communicative English classes and 136 in conventional English classes in which the focus was on teacher-based explanations of difficult grammatical points and accurate translation. The authors found that although the students were extrinsically motivated in both classes, Intrinsic Motivation showed significant relation to Motivation to Learn English ( $r = .58, p < .05$ ) in only those who were taking communicative English classes. Ngoc and Iwashita (2012) involved 37 teachers and 88 university students in Vietnam and compared their attitudes toward CLT. The majority of people in both groups had favorable attitudes toward CLT and communicative activities such as group and pair work. However, most students showed a strong desire for more accuracy in speaking, which is probably a wash-back effect from the grammar-based testing methods currently used in Vietnam. Chen (2015) investigated 27 Taiwanese high school students' attitudes toward CLT and found that some students, though they liked CLT, preferred to have more L1 explanation in the classroom because of their low English proficiency.

Some researchers have conducted research on Japanese students' attitudes toward CLT in Japanese contexts. For example, Taguchi (2013) investigated 1,534 Japanese university students who showed positive evaluations of university English classes due to the communicative teaching methodology. Taguchi explained that because Japanese university students' "ideal L2 self" is for speaking and communication purposes, communicative teaching classes met students' needs and expectations, whereas grammar-translation methods did not, and in fact are often considered as a demotivating factor (Kikuchi, 2009).

Nakayama, Pek, Tan, Taguchi, and Fukushima (2013) investigated 90 Japanese university students who participated in the two-week CLT-focused study abroad program in Malaysia. They found that, at least in the short term, the students increased their interest in English language and improved their ability to express ideas and thoughts in English with a significant score increase for listening and speaking tests. However, there was no significant increase for reading and writing tests.

Aubrey (2014) examined 202 Japanese students who enrolled in communicative English classes and found that after one semester many of the students seemingly connected classroom activities to their future self-concepts. Their L2 learning experiences led to the increased motivated L2 learning behaviors.

## Research Questions

Most studies on CLT explored teachers' attitudes toward CLT. Some researchers have investigated L2 learners' attitudes toward CLT, finding mostly positive attitudes towards it. However, such studies are still limited in number and few have closely examined how these attitudes relate to other L2 affective factors. In this study, I will investigate Japanese students who took English classes taught by a Japanese teacher and a native English-speaking teacher, and examine their attitudes toward CLT and their L2 affective factors. Thus, two research questions were investigated in this study.

1. What are the attitudes of the Japanese university students in this sample toward CLT by a self-reported survey administered at the end of the course?
2. How are their attitudes toward CLT related with eight L2 affective factors, Willingness to Communicate, Speaking Anxiety, International Posture, Intrinsic Motivation, Identified Regulation, Introjected Regulation, External Regulation, and Amotivation, as measured by a 28-item Likert scale survey administered on the final day of class?

## Method

### *Participants*

The participants in this study included 88 Japanese students (76 males and 12 females) majoring in engineering in a private Japanese university. The participants were all Japanese and remedial class students who failed English speaking classes taught by Japanese instructors in 2015 and who took a remedial English speaking class taught by a native English-speaking instructor in 2016. Japanese teachers used the same textbook and followed the teaching guidelines set up for the class, in which students listened to dialogs and answered comprehension questions, and engaged in mainly form-focused speaking exercises in the textbook. Because the students used the same textbook in the remedial class, a native English-speaking teacher, instead of relying on the textbook, created many discussion questions and had the students speak English frequently. He also spoke only English in the classroom. According to the students, the remedial class was more communicative than the regular class that they took in the previous semester.

### *Instrument*

The first part of the questionnaire asked the students whether they preferred English Speaking Class taught by a Japanese instructor or an English instructor and had them write down the reasons. The second part included a questionnaire that measured L2 affective factors. A 28-item questionnaire was used to measure eight L2 affective factors (Appendix A for English translation). The questionnaire was translated into Japanese language, the accuracy of which was checked by two English instructors using a back-translation procedure. Sixteen Motiva-

tion items were created based on Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Noels et al., 2001), four Language Anxiety items were adapted from Horwitz et al.'s (1986) Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), four International Posture items were adapted from Yashima (2002), and three L2 Willingness to Communicate items were adapted from Sick and Nagasaka (2000). The participants answered each question using a six-point Likert scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly Disagree, 4 = Slightly Agree, 5 = Agree, and 6 = Strongly Agree.

### *Procedure*

The students, who agreed to participate in the study, completed the questionnaire in the final class. Two students who did not complete the questionnaire were deleted, while twelve students had several missing responses and they were replaced with the mean for the item (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Therefore, the new  $n$ -size was 86. The first question was used to answer the first research question. Before analyzing the second part of the questionnaire, the data were subjected to factor analysis using SPSS 18.0, which ascertains variables. To examine the construct validity of each variable, the Rasch measurement model was employed through Winsteps 3.70. Wright and Linacre (1994) suggested that reasonable item mean-square ranges for INFIT and OUTFIT for a rating scale (survey) would be .6-1.4 (p. 370), and these were used in this study. The Rasch principal components analysis (PCA) of item residuals was used to determine unidimensionality (Bond & Fox, 2007; McNamara, 1996). According to Linacre (2007), the criteria for determining unidimensionality is that a variance explained by measures should be over 50%, and the first contrast should account for either less than 10% of the variance and/or have an eigenvalue less than 3.0 of the variance, with ideal eigenvalues being approximately 2.0. After validating the constructs, to answer the second research question, a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted for each variable, and a correlation analysis among affective variables was conducted for each group. The alpha level for statistical significance was set at .05.

## **Results and Discussion**

### *Research Question 1*

The first research question investigated 86 students' attitudes toward CLT. Among them, 81% of the students (70 students) preferred CLT, while 16 students preferred a traditional English class. Thus, like other studies (Ngoc & Iwashita, 2012; Savingnon & Wang, 2003; Shower, 2010), a majority of the students in this study also preferred classes in which English is taught more communicatively. From the students' comments, 42% wrote that they were able to listen to native speakers' English and three among them mentioned that their native English teacher spoke "*honba no eigo*" (genuine English). Although Abe (2013) reported that a majority of the Japanese students in her study considered that Japanese teachers spoke "standard English" and tended to be accepting of linguistic and cultural variation, the participants in this study seemed to prefer native English speak-

ers' English.

Next, 40% of the students indicated that they enjoyed the class. For example, "When my English sentence was understood by the teacher, I felt very happy," and "By taking this class, I felt as if I were talking with a foreigner in a real situation." Some students mentioned the difference from the class taught by a Japanese instructor: "The teacher was friendly and explained grammatical points roughly," "This class was not so-called 'text-book-based,'" "I learned English not in a conventional way, but in a lively way," and "This class focused on speaking so exclusively that I was able to speak English a lot in this class." Finally, three students pointed out that the class being taught only in English essentially forced them to focus more in order not to miss what the teacher said.

On the other hand, the main reason why 16 students preferred non-CLT was due to lack of English skills that prevented them from understanding what was being said in English. Additionally, some were reluctant to ask questions in English. Only one student said that he preferred the class taught by a Japanese teacher because he was accustomed to the Japanese teacher's teaching style. Consequently, it was found that the majority of the students preferred CLT because they enjoyed the native speaker's English and communicative activities, whereas other students preferred non-CLT because of their low ability in English. This result is in accordance with Chen (2015) who reported that some students-though they did not dislike CLT-preferred more use of L1 in classrooms due to their low English proficiency.

### *Research Question 2*

The second research question investigated how learners' attitudes toward CLT are related to eight L2 affective variables. The dimensionality of the 28 questionnaire items was examined using a principal axis factor analysis with a direct oblimin rotation. Item IP1 was deleted because it loaded below .40 on all factors. A factor analysis was then conducted with the remaining 26 items, and the results are shown in Table 1. Next, the Rasch measurement model was employed to examine the construct validity of each variable.

First, because Identified Regulation (ID) items and Introjected Regulation (INTRO) items loaded on the first factor, a Rasch analysis was conducted with these items. However, ID and INTRO items were found to form separate constructs (See Appendix B1 and B2 for the Rasch tables). Therefore, Identified Regulation and Introjected Regulation were analyzed separately in further analysis.

The second factor consisted of seven items: three International Posture Items (IP2, IP3, and IP4), three Intrinsic Motivation items (INT1, INT2, and INT3), and one External Regulation Item (EXT4). A Rasch analysis was performed with all IP items, all INT items, and item EXT4. In this analysis, IP4 "I would like to travel abroad," did not fit the model possibly because many students did not connect traveling abroad to English speaking since participating in a sightseeing tour does not require foreign language skills. Unlike factor analysis results, IP1 "I would like to communicate freely with foreign people" fit the Rasch model, so it was included in

Table 1. *Factor Loadings of Questionnaire Items.*

Variables	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Communality
WTC 1	.16	.14	.13	-.18	.04	<b>.79</b>	.86
WTC 2	.04	.13	-.08	.10	-.10	<b>.69</b>	.69
WTC 3	-.03	.03	-.05	.05	.02	<b>.93</b>	.88
ANX 1	-.05	.09	<b>.80</b>	.07	-.10	.00	.68
ANX 2	.00	-.02	<b>.81</b>	.03	.04	.06	.65
ANX 3	.03	-.08	<b>.85</b>	-.00	.02	.12	.74
ANX 4	-.03	-.01	<b>.78</b>	-.00	.06	-.21	.64
IP 2	-.21	<b>.74</b>	-.16	.02	-.14	.02	.59
IP 3	.00	<b>.65</b>	.11	-.03	-.26	-.03	.53
IP 4	.25	<b>.58</b>	.17	-.28	.03	.14	.61
INT 1	.01	<b>.71</b>	.14	.03	.04	.23	.76
INT 2	-.11	<b>.83</b>	-.01	.06	.07	.19	.86
INT 3	.10	<b>.74</b>	-.08	.08	.11	.14	.74
ID 1	<b>.67</b>	-.05	.13	-.04	-.31	.15	.82
ID 2	<b>.74</b>	.00	.10	-.05	-.23	.00	.76
ID 3	<b>.80</b>	-.01	.04	-.09	-.18	.11	.81
INTRO 1	<b>.72</b>	-.07	-.07	.23	.09	.11	.64
INTRO 2	<b>.53</b>	.25	-.05	.11	.08	-.04	.39
INTRO 3	<b>.73</b>	-.09	.05	.11	-.16	.02	.71
EXT 1	.32	-.02	.21	<b>.59</b>	-.08	-.11	.67
EXT 2	.07	-.22	.14	<b>.80</b>	-.06	.02	.84
EXT 3	-.02	-.06	-.05	<b>.72</b>	.01	.04	.51
EXT 4	.30	<b>.68</b>	-.06	.13	.18	.06	.70
AM 1	-.17	.03	.05	.01	<b>.86</b>	.09	.81
AM 2	.04	-.05	-.02	-.26	<b>.58</b>	-.35	.67
AM 3	-.21	-.11	-.08	-.01	<b>.74</b>	.06	.82
% of variance	32.71	16.16	8.30	5.93	4.25	3.31	70.66

*Note.* Boldface indicates factor loadings higher than .40. WTC = L2 Willingness to Communicate ; ANX = L2 Speaking Anxiety ; IP = International Posture ; INT = Intrinsic Motivation ; ID = Identified Regulation ; INTRO = Introjected Regulation ; EXT = External Regulation ; AM = Amotivation.

this construct. Item EXT4 “I study English for traveling” was first categorized in External Regulation, but it loaded with this construct in both factor analysis and Rasch analysis, so this item was included in this construct. Therefore, this construct was labeled International Posture and Intrinsic Motivation (IPINT) (Appendix B3).

The third factor includes four L2 Speaking Anxiety items, ANX1, ANX2, ANX3, and ANX4. All the items met the criterion in the Rasch analysis. Thus, this construct was labeled L2 Speaking Anxiety (Appendix B4).

The fourth factor consists of three External Regulation items, EXT1, EXT2, and EXT3. In the Rasch analysis, all these items matched the criterion, so Factor 4 was labeled External Regulation (Appendix B5).

The fifth factor consists of three Amotivation items, Items AM1, AM2, and AM3. The Rasch measurement model was employed, and all the items met the criterion, so Factor 5 was labeled Amotivation (Appendix B6).

The sixth factor consists of three L2 Willingness to Communicate items, WTC 1, WTC 2, and WTC 3. The Rasch analysis was performed on three items and all the items met the criterion, so Factor 6 was labeled L2 Willingness to Communicate (Appendix B7).

After the validation of the construct using a Rasch measurement model, seven L2 affective variables (International Posture & Intrinsic Motivation, Identified Regulation, Introjected Regulation, External Regulation, Amotivation, L2 Speaking Anxiety, and L2 Willingness to Communicate) were used in the main analysis. Then, a MANOVA was conducted for the Rasch measures of each variable. Rasch measures were used because the Rasch model converts ordinal raw scores to interval measures known as logits (i.e., log-odd units), indicating the relative difficulty of each item in comparison with other items in the questionnaire and placing both people and items on a single logit scale (Bond & Fox, 2007). Table 2 contains the means and the standard deviations of the dependent variables for each group.

A MANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of the preference in teaching methodology (CLT or Non-CLT) on the seven affective variables. The test for homogeneity of dispersion matrices was nonsignificant,  $F(28,2579.66) = .83, p = .72$ , indicating that the variances and covariance among the dependent variables are the same for all levels of each given factor. An ANOVA for each dependent variable was conducted as a follow-up test to the MANOVA. Using the Bonferroni method, each ANOVA was tested at the .007 level (.05/7). The results showed that the ANOVA for IPINT was significant,  $F(1,34.92) = 15.48, p < .007$ , as was the ANOVA for WTC,  $F(1,199.37) = 14.02, p < .007$ . Therefore, those who preferred CLT tended to have greater international posture, intrinsic motivation, and a greater desire to communicate in English than those who preferred Non-CLT.

This result is in accordance with Pae and Shin (2011) who discovered that when students learned English by means of the teacher-based explanations of difficult grammatical points and accurate translations, the students were more likely to be motivated extrinsically, but intrinsic motivation was found to operate for the stu-

Table 2 *Rasch Measures of Each Affective Variable for Each Group*

Variable	CLT (N= 70)		Non-CLT (N= 16)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
WTC	.91	3.83	-3.00	3.46
ANX	1.08	2.37	2.14	2.32
IPID	-.24	1.51	-1.87	1.45
ID	2.83	5.59	1.41	5.36
INTRO	-.15	2.44	-.89	3.11
EXT	.26	2.32	.05	2.15
AM	-.89	3.19	.27	3.02

*Note.* WTC = L2 Willingness to Communicate ; ANX = L2 Speaking Anxiety ; IP = International Posture ; INT = Intrinsic Motivation ; ID = Identified Regulation ; INTRO = Introjected Regulation ; EXT = External Regulation ; AM = Amotivation.



Table 3 *Correlations Among Seven Affective Variables for CLT preference group (n= 70)*

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. WTC	—						
2. ANX	.17	—					
3. IPINT	.64**	.22	—				
4. ID	.29*	.35**	.31**	—			
5. INTRO	.41**	.44**	.29*	.68**	—		
6. EXT	.19	.15	.26*	.41**	.55**	—	
7. AM	-.33**	-.38**	-.28*	-.63**	-.50**	-.34**	—

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ Table 4 *Correlations Among Seven Affective Variables for Non-CLT preference group (n= 16)*

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. WTC	—						
2. ANX	-.65**	—					
3. IPINT	.61**	-.51**	—				
4. ID	.26	-.23	.26	—			
5. INTRO	.15	-.23	.15	.82**	—		
6. EXT	.08	.04	.25	.38	.23	—	
7. AM	-.35	.25	-.18	-.44	-.41	-.23	—

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ 

dents in communicative classroom environments. Likewise, in this study the students who preferred communicative classes were significantly more intrinsically motivated than those who preferred non-CLT. In fact, Intrinsic Motivation is considered to be associated with L2 speaking. For example, Busse and Walter (2013) reported a decrease of Intrinsic Motivation of first-year students due to a lack of L2 oral communication in their L2 classes. Moreover, Pae (2008) related the superiority of Intrinsic Motivation in a Korean EFL setting to their CLT-based English curriculum that increased the pleasure of learning English.

Non-English majors are often reported to be more extrinsically than intrinsically motivated because they tend to study English for instrumental purposes such as getting a credit to graduate and/or getting a better job (e. g., Honda, 2005; Johnson, 2013). Additionally, my previous study (Iwamoto, 2013) which investigated participants in the same department as this study revealed most of them were motivated to learn English for instrumental purposes. Therefore, with regard to non-English majors, attention is often paid to their extrinsic motivation, but the intensity of intrinsic motivation and international posture was found to be a key as to whether the students actually enjoyed engaging in L2 communication or not.

Next, correlations among the seven variables for each group were calculated. The results are shown in Tables 3 and 4 for CLT preference and non-CLT preference groups, respectively. For both groups, the strongest correlations are between Identified Regulation and Introjected Regulation, implying that those who think English is important tend to feel pressure that they need to study English much more intensively. Moreover, for both

groups, IPINT and WTC correlate strongly. In other words, those who are interested in foreign countries and culture and who enjoy speaking English also tend to be more willing to speak English. A notable finding is that L2 Speaking Anxiety is positively correlated with Identified Regulation and Introjected Regulation, and negatively correlated with Amotivation for the CLT preference group. This result differs from most studies, which have reported that anxiety negatively effects L2 learning (e.g., MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989; Noels et al., 1999). On the contrary, in this study the respondents' anxiety seems to be beneficial for L2 learning and can be considered as a facilitative anxiety. Scovel (1991) defines facilitative anxiety as being what "motivates the learner to 'fight' the new learning task" (p.22). Research on facilitative anxiety is not very common and is reported in very few studies (e.g., Brown, Robson, & Rosenkjar, 2001; Takahashi, 2003). In this study, those students having facilitative anxiety—the students with greater L2 speaking anxiety—tend to consider that speaking English is so important that they need to study it with great intensity, and they would feel guilty if they did not study enough. Moreover, because anxiety is negatively correlated with amotivation, having greater anxiety levels can be a motivating factor in learning to speak English. Therefore, these students enjoyed communicative activities in their English classes that they believed would help them improve their English speaking skills.

In contrast, L2 Speaking Anxiety in the non-CLT preference group was negatively correlated with WTC, implying that those with greater anxiety toward speaking English tend to be less willing to speak English. This result parallels many other WTC studies reporting a detrimental effect from L2 Speaking Anxiety on WTC (e.g., Liu & Jackson, 2008; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; Yashima, 2002). Interestingly, no significant difference was found for the anxiety scores between the two groups, suggesting that the intensity of L2 speaking anxiety was similar, but the characteristics of their anxiety were different. It appears that most of those in the CLT preference group had facilitative anxiety, whereas most of in the non-CLT preference group had debilitating anxiety.

## Conclusion

This study investigated 86 university students' attitudes toward CLT and how those attitudes correlated with seven affective factors. A majority of students preferred CLT and they tended to be more intrinsically motivated and tended to have a greater desire to communicate in English than others. However, there are three limitations of this study. First, since all of the informants took classes from the same native English teacher, it is possible that the personality of the teacher influenced the ratings. Future studies should seek to examine how rating might vary with multiple teachers. Second, the informants in this study came from special classes for repeaters : those who have failed a required English class at least once. Future studies should compare these results with classes for general English classes who have not failed. Third, this study did not examine the possible impact of gender or age on student ratings. Future studies should probably explore those possible variables.

Despite these limitations, the findings of this study suggest two implications. First, because a majority of the students preferred CLT, perhaps English classes should be more meaning-based than form-based. However,

some students with low L2 communicative abilities had difficulty dealing with this English-only class, so in such cases it might be better to place them in the class in which Japanese is also used as a linguistic accommodation in order to provide a more comfortable environment. Indeed, Chen (2015) mentions that the use of L1 can increase comprehension and reduce anxiety of learners with low English proficiency. Secondly, although the students had similar levels of L2 speaking anxiety intensity, some people responded in debilitating ways, whereas others felt the anxiety facilitated their achievements. Thus, it is important for teachers to consider which type of anxiety that learners have because they have antithetical effects on L2 learning.

The results of this study suggest that those who prefer CLT tend to have facilitative anxiety, while those who do not like CLT (perhaps due to a lack of English ability) tend to have debilitating anxiety. The phenomenon of facilitative anxiety in particular seems worth investigating more closely in the future. If possible, it would be ideal to also discover a way to shift from debilitating to facilitative anxiety.

Because of globalization in Japan, the value of better English communicative skills has been greatly recognized. Because of this, it seems likely that more CLT will be implemented in English classes in Japan. So far, many studies on CLT focus attention on teachers' attitudes and there are still limited studies investigating Japanese students' attitudes toward CLT. However, exploring learner attitudes will surely help teachers find better way of conducting CLT in their classrooms.

## References

- Abe, E. (2013). Communicative language teaching in Japan: Current practices and future prospects. *English Today*, 29, 46-53.
- Aubrey, S. (2014). Development of the L2 motivational self system: English at a university in Japan. *JALT Journal*, 36(2), 153-174.
- Bond, T. G., & Fox, C. M. (2007). *Applying the Rasch Model: Fundamental measurement in the human sciences*. 2nd edition. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Brown, J. D., Robson, R., & Rosenkjar, P. (2001). Personality, motivation, anxiety, strategies, and language proficiency of Japanese students. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 361-398). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Busse, V., & Walter, C. (2013). Foreign language learning motivation in higher education: A longitudinal study of motivational changes and their causes. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97, 435-456. Doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12004.x
- Butler, Y. G. (2011). The implementation of communicative and task-based language teaching in the Asia-Pacific region. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 36-57. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000122>

- Chen, W. (2015). A case study of action research on communicative language teaching. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Mathematics*, 18(6), 705-717. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09720502.2015.1108075>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York, NY: Plenum.
- Honda, K. (2005). Learner difference and diversity in intrinsic/extrinsic motivation among Japanese EFL learners. *Memoirs of Osaka Kyoiku University*, 54, 23-46.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70, 125-132. Doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb 05256.x
- Iwamoto, N. (2013). Factors predicting motivational intensity in Japanese EFL engineering majors. *The Bulletin of the Institute of Human Sciences, Toyo University*, 15, 17-30.
- Johnson, M. P. (2013). A longitudinal perspective on EFL learning motivation in Japanese engineering students. In M. Apple, D. D. Silva & T. Fellner (Eds.), *Language learning motivation in Japan* (pp. 189-205). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Kikuchi, K. (2006). Revisiting English entrance examinations at Japanese universities after a decade. *JALT Journal*, 25(1), 7-96.
- Kikuchi, K. (2009). Student demotivation in Japanese high school English classrooms: Exploring with qualitative research methods. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(4), 453-471. Doi: 10.1177/1362168809341520
- Linacre, J. M. (2007). *A user's guide to WINSTEPS: Rasch model computer program*. Chicago, IL: MESA.
- Liu, M., & Jackson, J. (2008). An exploration of Chinese EFL learners' unwillingness to communicate and foreign language anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92, 71-86. Doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00687.x
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Charos, C. (1996). Personality, attitudes, and affect as predictors of second language communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 15, 3-26. Doi: 10.1177/0261927 X 960151001
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1989). Anxiety and second language learning: Toward a theoretical understanding. *Language Learning*, 39, 251-275. Doi: 10.1111/j.1467-1770.1989.tb 00423.x
- McNamara, T. F. (1996). *Measuring second language performance*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Nakayama, T., Pek, H. C., Tan, S. K., Taguchi, S., & Fukushima, K. (2013). Learning English as an international language: Study abroad in a multilingual society. *Josai International Review*, 18, 61-85.
- Ngoc, K. M., & Iwashita, N. (2012). A comparison of learners' and teachers' attitudes toward communicative language teaching at two universities in Vietnam. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL*, 7, 25-49.
- Nishino, T. (2012). Modeling teacher beliefs and practices in context: A multimethod approach. *The Modern Language Journal*, 96, 380-399. Doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2012.01364.x
- Noels, K., Clément, R., & Pelletier, L.G. (1999). Perceptions of teachers' communicative style and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83, 23-34.
- Noels, K. A., Clément, R., & Pelletier, L. G. (2001). Intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations of French

- Canadian learners of English. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 424-444.
- Pae, T-I. (2008). Second language orientation and self-determination theory: A structural analysis of the factors affecting second language achievement. *Journal of Language and Second Language Achievement*, 27, 5-27.
- Pae, T-I., & Shin, S. (2011). Examining the effects of differential instructional methods on the model of foreign language achievement. *Language and Individual Differences*, 21, 215-222.
- Sato, K., & Kleinsasser, R. C. (1999). Communicative language teaching (CLT): Practical understandings. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83, 494-517.
- Savingnon, S. J., & Wang, C. (2003). Communicative language teaching in EFL contexts: Learner attitudes and perceptions. *IRAL*, 41, 223-249.
- Scovel, T. (1991). The effect of affect on foreign language learning: A review of the anxiety research. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp. 15-23). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Shower, S. (2010). Communicative-based curriculum innovations between theory and practice: Implications for ELF curriculum development and student cognitive and affective change. *The Curriculum Journal*, 21(3), 333-359.
- Sick, J. R., & Nagasaka, J. P. (2000). A test of your willingness to communicate in English. Unpublished Questionnaire.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Taguchi, T. (2013). Motivation, attitudes and selves in the Japanese context: A mixed methods approach. In M. Apple, D. D. Silva & T. Fellner (Eds.), *Language learning motivation in Japan* (pp. 169-188). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Takahashi, A. (2003). A study on the relationship between language anxiety and English proficiency amongst Japanese university EFL learners. *Niigata Studies in Foreign Languages and Cultures*, 9, 149-163
- Thorne, C., & Qiang, W. (1996). Action research in language teacher education. *ELT Journal*, 50(3), 254-262.
- Wright, B. D., & Linacre, J. M. (1994). Reasonable mean-square fit values. *Rasch Measurement Transactions*, 8 (3), 370
- Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86, 54-66. Doi: 10.1111/1540-4781.00136

## Appendix A. An English Translation of the Questionnaire Items

---

Questionnaire Items	
<hr/>	
WTC 1	I would be willing to start an English conversation with a foreigner.
WTC 2	I would be willing to start an English conversation with my English teacher outside of class.
WTC 3	I want to speak English when I travel abroad.
ANX 1	I feel nervous speaking English.
ANX 2	I lack confidence in my English-speaking abilities.
ANX 3	I worry that I will make mistakes when I speak English.
ANX 4	I tremble at the thought that I am going to be called on in English class.
IP 1	I would like to communicate freely in English with foreign people.
IP 2	I would like to study abroad if possible.
IP 3	I am interested in the culture and people of English-speaking countries.
IP 4	I would like to travel abroad.
INT 1	I enjoy learning to speak English.
INT 2	I have a good feeling when hearing and speaking English.
INT 3	I study English for the pleasure I experience when I improve my English speaking skills.
ID 1	English is a must for me to succeed in the future.
ID 2	English is necessary in today's internationalized world.
ID 3	I think English is useful in many situations.
INTRO 1	I think I would feel embarrassed if I would not be able to speak English in the future.
INTRO 2	I would feel guilty if I did not study English.
INTRO 3	I really think that I need to study English hard.
EXT 1	I study English because I think it will be useful in getting a good job.
EXT 2	I learn English to be more knowledgeable.
EXT 3	I study English to improve my TOEIC score.
EXT 4	I study English for traveling.
AM 1	English is not necessary for engineering students.
AM 2	I do not want to study English at university.
AM 3	I have the impression of wasting my time when studying English.

---

## Appendix B. Rasch Item Statistics for Each Affective Variable

Table B 1. *Rasch Item Statistics for the Identified Regulation Items*

Item	Measure	SE	Infit MNSQ	Outfit MNSQ	Pt-measure correlation
ID 1	1.18	.3	.96	1.03	.94
ID 2	-.88	.3	1.02	1.03	.94
ID 3	-.30	.3	.95	.99	.95

Note.  $n = 86$ . Rasch item reliability = .89. Rasch person reliability = .75.

Table B 2. *Rasch Item Statistics for the Introjected Regulation Items*

Item	Measure	SE	Infit MNSQ	Outfit MNSQ	Pt-measure correlation
INTRO 1	.05	.2	.94	.89	.89
INTRO 2	.95	.2	1.22	1.27	.82
INTRO 3	-1.00	.2	.81	.81	.86

Note.  $n = 86$ . Rasch item reliability = .95. Rasch person reliability = .74.

Table B 3. *Rasch Item Statistics for the International Posture and Intrinsic Motivation Items*

Item	Measure	SE	Infit MNSQ	Outfit MNSQ	Pt-measure correlation
IP 3	-.69	.1	1.28	1.25	.76
EXT 5	-.12	.1	1.08	1.17	.76
IP 1	.01	.1	1.08	1.10	.73
IP 2	.87	.1	1.06	1.01	.74
INT 3	-.04	.1	.85	.85	.81
INT 1	-.02	.1	.58	.59	.84

Note.  $n = 86$ . Rasch item reliability = .91. Rasch person reliability = .83.

Table B 4. *Rasch Item Statistics for the L 2 Speaking Anxiety Items*

Item	Measure	SE	Infit MNSQ	Outfit MNSQ	Pt-measure correlation
ANX 4	.47	.2	1.32	1.31	.82
ANX 1	.43	.2	.92	.98	.85
ANX 2	-.68	.2	.88	.84	.84
ANX 3	-.21	.2	.81	.80	.87

Note.  $n = 86$ . Rasch item reliability = .89. Rasch person reliability = .76.

Table B 5. *Rasch Item Statistics for the External Regulation Items*

Item	Measure	SE	Infit MNSQ	Outfit MNSQ	Pt-measure correlation
EXT 3	1.28	.2	1.28	1.32	.81
EXT 1	1.18	.2	1.18	1.15	.84
EXT 2	.52	.2	.52	.51	.90

Note.  $n = 86$ . Rasch item reliability = .92. Rasch person reliability = .60.

Table B 6. *Rasch Item Statistics for the Amotivation Items*

Item	Measure	SE	Infit MNSQ	Outfit MNSQ	Pt-measure correlation
AM 2	-1.39	.2	1.19	1.26	.85
AM 1	.52	.2	1.00	1.04	.89
AM 3	.87	.2	.73	.68	.91

*Note.*  $n = 86$ . Rasch item reliability = .96. Rasch person reliability = .70.

Table B 7. *Rasch Item Statistics for the L 2 WTC Items*

Item	Measure	SE	Infit MNSQ	Outfit MNSQ	Pt-measure correlation
WTC 2	.84	.2	1.20	1.18	.88
WTC 1	-1.07	.2	.92	.90	.92
WTC 3	.23	.2	.75	.79	.94

*Note.*  $n = 86$ . Rasch item reliability = .93. Rasch person reliability = .85.



## 【Abstract】

英語学習者のコミュニカティブ・ランゲージ・  
ティーチングに対する意識・態度

岩本 典子\*

本論文では、英語クラスのコミュニカティブ・ランゲージ・ティーチング（CLT）に対する理工学部生 86 名の意識・態度について調査をおこなった。CLT による英語授業では、ネイティブ英語教員が英語のみを使用して授業を行い、学生は多くのコミュニカティブなアクティビティーに従事した。アンケート調査の結果、大部分の学生（81%）が CLT による英語授業を好むことがわかった。次に多変量分散分析を用いて、CLT に対する態度と第二言語情意要因の関係を調べた結果、CLT を好む学生はそうでない学生に比べて、国際的志向性と内発的動機の数値が有意に高く、さらに英語を使ったコミュニケーションにより積極的に取り組む気持ちがあることが明らかになった。また前者の言語不安は促進的不安であったが、後者は抑制的不安を持つという違いがみられた。

キーワード：コミュニカティブ・ランゲージ・ティーチング、英語学習動機、英語スピーキング不安、英語で対話する意思、理工学部生

The present study investigated the attitudes toward communicative language teaching (CLT) of 86 Japanese engineering majors. The results of a questionnaire administered at the end of semester-length course taught in a CLT format by a “native” English speaker revealed that a majority of the students (81%) preferred CLT class in which a “native” English-speaking teacher spoke only English and used many communicative activities. The results of a MANOVA revealed that those who preferred CLT tended to have a greater international posture and intrinsic motivation to learn English. They also appeared to be more willing to communicate in English than those who preferred non-CLT classes. Moreover, the former group of students tended to exhibit facilitative anxiety, whereas the latter group of students tended to exhibit debilitating anxiety.

**Key words** : communicative language teaching, motivation to learn English, English speaking anxiety, willingness to communicate in English, engineering majors

---

\* 人間科学総合研究所研究員・東洋大学理工学部